



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,612	08/03/2001	Harjinder Dulai	00100.01.0051	7518
23418	7590	04/21/2004	EXAMINER	
VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ 222 N. LASALLE STREET CHICAGO, IL 60601			DUVERNE, JEAN F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2839	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/921,612

Applicant(s)

DULAI ET AL. 

Examiner

Jean F. Duverne

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 26-28 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-14, 16-25 and 29-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 15, 34 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-25, 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenberg et al (US patent 5,793,352) in view of Perlman (US patent 6,169,879).

In regard to claims 1-3, 7-9, 29-30, Greenberg's device discloses a block or housing having a longitudinal axis and including a top surface, a bottom surface, a front surface, a back surface, and side surfaces such that the first and second side surfaces are oppositely disposed (see figs. 1-4); a plurality of jacks (40, 40', 42, 44, 53, 53', 42) for connection with peripheral devices disposed on the first and second side surfaces; a recessed portion formed on the first side surface having at least one of the plurality jacks (53) disposed therein; a projecting portion formed on the second side surface having at least one of the plurality of jacks (44') disposed therein; an cable (54) associate with the back surface and high density conductor connection at 56, 58 (see fig. 1 col. 3, lines 54-59) with the jacks, the jacks with audio, video, stereo-audio inputs and outputs (see figs. 1-2, 4) with the diagram showing the stereo audio input and output (42, 84, 84'), the video input by using the mouse at 44, 44' to select the input and output at 45, 40, 53, 55) or see col. 1, line 36-56, cols 3-4, lines 21-60). However,

Greenberg's device fails to explicitly disclose different surface shape in recess or the side surface as being opposed to each other because the connecting device has a circular shape (no sides) and a high density connection plug located on the interconnection block for computer components. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to place the input jack on one side and the output jacks on another side, the high density connection plug with the computer; since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In *Japike*, 86 USPQ 70. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use different arrangement to meet the system design and requirement. Greenberg's device also fails to explicitly disclose the use of the S-video. Perlman's device discloses an audio and video interconnection system with the use of the S-video. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add the S-video to the system such as the one disclosed in Perlman's to meet the design requirement in Greenberg's device.

In regard to claims 4, 12-14, 16-18, 19-23, 32, Greenberg's and Perlman devices disclose the aforementioned limitations, but fail to explicitly disclose different arrangement features for the jacks connectors. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to place a rib on the top surface and the cable disposed at an offset from the longitudinal axis, first side surface being parallel to the second side surface or angular arrangement of elements, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In *Japike*, 86 USPQ 70. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use different arrangement to meet the system design and requirement.

For claims 5, 10-11, and 24-25, 31, 33, Greenberg's and Perlman devices disclose the aforementioned limitations including a transmitter, and the use of the infrared transceiver. Perlman's device discloses the use of the infrared transceiver (see col. 3, lines 60-63). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the transmitter device such as the one used in Perlman's device for relaying remote control signal in Greenberg's device.

### ***Response to Argument***

Applicant's arguments/amendment filed on 3/22/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The claims do not define "structural structure features" that distinguish over prior art. For example, Greenberg's device discloses a block or housing having a longitudinal axis and including a top surface, a bottom surface, a front surface, a back surface, and side surfaces such that the first and second side surfaces are oppositely disposed a plurality of jacks for connection with peripheral devices disposed on the first and second side surfaces; a recessed portion formed on the first side surface having at least one of the plurality jacks (see the above rejection). Furthermore, in response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the reference, the Examiner recognized that references cannot arbitrarily combined and that there must be some reason why one skill in the art would be motivated to make the proposed combination of the primary and secondary references. In re Nomiya, 184 USPQ 607 (CCPA 1985). However, there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly articulated. The test for combining reference is what the

Art Unit: 2839

combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one skill in the art. In re McLaughlin, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). References are evaluated by what suggest to one versed in the art, rather by their specific disclosures. In re Bozek, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA) 1969.

### ***Conclusion***

2. Claims 6, 15, 34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Prior art fails to disclose the first and second side surface with the multi-faceted portion recessed portion and projected portion defined by plurality of surface elements, ; the with the rest of the claims limitations.

Claims 26-28 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean F. Duverne whose telephone number is (703) 872-9306. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-7:30, Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached on (703) 308-2710. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

**Any response to this action may be mailed to:**

Art Unit: 2839

**Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**


For additional information regarding this new address, which was effective May 1, 2003, see *Correspondence with the United States Patent and Trademark Office*, 68 Fed. Reg. 14332 (March 25, 2003).

**Or Faxed to:**  
(703) 872-9306.

**Hand-delivered responses** should be brought to:  
Crystal Plaza 4, Fourth Floor (Receptionist)  
2201 South Clark Place, Arlington, Virginia

JFD

04/04/2004



Jean Frantz Beverne  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2839